DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 244 HE 014 756

AUTHOR Harari, Maurice
TITLE Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus: Guidelines for AASCU Institutions.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO AASCU-1981-3; ISBN-0-88044-059-7
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 65p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036 ($4.00, quantity discounts).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; *College Curriculum; College Second Language Programs; Curriculum Development; English (Second Language); Ethnic Studies; Financial Support; *Global Approach; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *International Education; International Educational Exchange; School Surveys; *State Colleges; State Universities; Study Abroad; *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

Information about internationalizing undergraduate education is presented. Data gathered from the membership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) provide a profile of the degree of internationalization of these institutions. Additionally, major means of internationalizing the curriculum and the institution are identified, and practical guidelines are summarized to assist those who wish to know where and how to start to internationalize their campus or how to strengthen and refine that process. Survey results provide information on the extent of internationalization of the institutions using a five category classification scheme, the distribution of variables (e.g., the existence of planned international programs, study abroad, and program relations with the less developed countries), the seeking of grants and success rate, ethnic studies, institutional location and size, institutional operating budget, and requirements for graduation, foreign languages, and teaching English as a second language. The major curricular options that might be considered are: the infusion of nonwestern material, comparative approaches, issue-oriented approaches, area and civilization studies, intercultural communication, international development studies, and international studies major or minor. Establishing international education exchanges and funding arrangements are addressed. A list of 13 guidelines for AASCU institutions, a bibliography, a sample questionnaire, and information on funding sources are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212244

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM AND THE CAMPUS: Guidelines for AASCU Institutions

Maurice Harari
Vice President for International Programs
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

AASCU STUDIES 1981/3

November 1981

Allan W. Ostar
President

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

American Assn of State Colleges & Universities

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE014 756

© 1981 by American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publications Data

Harari, Maurice.
Internationalizing the curriculum and the campus.

(AASCU studies; 1981/3)
Bibliography: p.
1. State universities and colleges—United States—Curricula. 2. International education—United States.
I. Title. II. Series.
LB2329.5.A43 1981/3 378'.199'0973 81-19113
AACR2

ISBN: 0-88044-059-7
ISSN: 0278-4130

The opinions and recommendations in this book are those of the author and are not intended to represent the official policy of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Introduction 1

1. Analysis of Survey Results 3
- The Survey Instrument
- Categorization Based on Degree of Internationalization
- Commentary on Data Results
- Survey Results

2. Internationalizing the Curriculum: The Options 17
- The Infusion of Disciplines
- Comparative Approaches
- Issue-Oriented Approaches
- Area and Civilization Studies
- Intercultural Communication
- International Development: Study and Practice
- The International Studies Major or Minor
- General Comments on Undergraduate Planning in International Studies

3. Internationalizing the Institution 29
- The Need for Planning and Consensus-Building
- Establishing Exchanges
- The U.S. University and International Development
- The Office of International Programs: A Model
- Background on the Funding Issue
- A National Perspective on the Funding Issue
- Future Directions

4. Conclusion: Guidelines for AASCU Institutions 45

Selected Bibliography 48

Appendix A – Survey Instrument 50

Appendix B – International Programming: Funding Sources 55

FOREWORD

This report, sponsored by the AASCU Committee on International Programs, is designed to be of service to all AASCU institutions irrespective of their stage of sophistication in the development of their international mission and programs. In fact, it should be a most useful report for all those concerned with the international dimension of undergraduate education and the increasingly critical issues of international studies, foreign languages, international exchanges, and educational cooperation with other countries.

The author of the report, Dr. Maurice Harari, AASCU Vice President for International Programs, has extensive experience in the international field and is eminently qualified to analyze the major trends and to offer his insights and recommendations. We are grateful to him and to AASCU for this publication, which should serve as an excellent agenda for institutional study and possible action.

Hugh La Bounty, Chairman
AASCU Committee on International Programs
President, California State Polytechnic University-Pomona

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide the institutional members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and others interested in the internationalization of undergraduate education with pertinent information, analysis, and practical guidance. The first section represents an analysis of data gathered from the AASCU membership; on the basis of a number of criteria devised by the author, it gives a profile of the degree of internationalization of AASCU institutions. The subsequent sections are designed to assist institutions, irrespective of where they might now place themselves in the profile, to strengthen their degree of internationalization. For that purpose, therefore, the second section attempts to identify major means of internationalizing the curriculum, and the third section discusses the key features of the process of internationalizing the institution. Practical guidelines are summarized in the fourth section for the benefit of those who wish to know where and how to start to internationalize their campus or how to strengthen and refine that process if it is already underway.

It is hardly necessary to elaborate at length on the need to internationalize undergraduate education in U.S. colleges and universities. The startling acceleration of global interdependence and the obvious intersection of major domestic and international issues confronting the United States have deep implications for the curriculum, requiring that each institution of higher learning examine its international role and responsibility. Whether one stresses the habits of inquisitive and rational thinking, the balance between the liberal arts and vocational education, or the need for distributive requirements in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities, the basic need to impart global attitudes, intercultural sensitivity, and knowledge about the problems of interdependence and human survival is critical. The very nature of international-intercultural education transcends any particular discipline or school. It belongs to the entire curriculum and to the values to be imparted to students to enable them to function effectively and humanely in a conglomerate of nations, races, cultures, economies, and military-industrial complexes.

Issues of war and peace, nuclear stockpiling, disarmament, north-south relations, food and population, energy, and quality of life impinge heavily on all of us. In the extreme, these issues involve nothing less than human survival. The national and international policies and strategies pursued in the next two or three decades are complex. They no longer require the technical skills of only a few in each nation. They require the global literacy and global awareness of the populations around the world. International understanding has come to represent a very practical and urgent need, and clearly higher education has the major responsibility in this area in the long term.

The purposes of the survey of international programs in AASCU institutions conducted by the Office of International Programs, the results and

analysis of which are presented in the first section of this report, are to enable each institution to gauge its development in relation to at least the national AASCU constituency; to stimulate AASCU institutions to examine and refine their mission, commitment, and programs in the international area; and to provide those concerned about the quality and global orientation of undergraduate education with information, which, it is hoped, will be valuable in their planning efforts. Moving beyond the data, however, this report attempts to provide guidance in the two areas crucial to the long-term internationalization of the institution: curricular approaches and the process of internationalizing the institution.

The writing of this report would not have been possible without the encouragement of the AASCU Committee on International Programs and the individuals on campus who conscientiously filled out the survey questionnaire. I am grateful to all of these parties and to the dozens of individuals I was able to interview personally. Several of my colleagues at AASCU assisted me in the preparation of this publication, including Jay Stampen and Ginnie Russell, but I especially want to thank Mai Thi Phung and Cathryn Ryan for their enviable ability to communicate intelligently with computers and to Betsy Harding for her editorial finesse. None of them, however, can be held responsible for the interpretations and judgments offered in this publication; these must remain the sole responsibility of the author.

Maurice Harari

1. ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESULTS

The Survey Instrument

The Survey Instrument (see Appendix A) was designed to be filled out in about an hour, on the average. The portion to be completed by the president of the institution consisted of three brief questions that required only a few minutes. Asking detailed questions on the extent of internationalization of specific disciplines and courses was considered but avoided because such questions would have complicated considerably the ability, or desire, of institutions to respond. Similarly, detailed questions on the funding of international programs were excluded. The total budgets expended on international programs, how much from internal and how much from external sources, and what these sources were represent interesting data, but were excluded because some pretesting confirmed that requesting such information would reduce considerably the number of respondents. The questionnaire was also tailored to include the data covered in the AASCU Office of International Programs questionnaire of November 1977[1], and on balance represents a good compromise between obtaining maximal data from only a few institutions and obtaining a meaningful response from a reasonably large percentage of institutions surveyed. The approach paid off, in that 264 institutions, or 77.19% of the AASCU membership, responded in time to be included in the analysis.

Finally, it should be noted that in addition to the data supplied by the survey, other data already available to AASCU were also used, e.g., the overall budget of the institution and its enrollment. The analysis presented here is based on this composite data base.

Categorization Based on Degree of Internationalization

There is little disagreement among experts in international education as to what are the different strands that combine to indicate the aggregate degree of internationalization of an institution. Although some intangibles are difficult to assess, a qualified consultant on a campus can easily capture the international ethos of the institution on the basis of attitudes, commitment, and plans, as well as on such data as the international orientation of the curriculum, degree of institutional engagement in the international movement of students and faculty, existing cooperative relations with other countries, international experience and interest of the faculty and the administration, availability of library and audio visual resources related to

---

[1] *International and Intercultural Education in Selected State Colleges and Universities*, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, November 1977.

international studies, and organizational arrangements made by the institution to provide leadership. Short of such in-depth on-site assessment of programs, attitudes, and commitments, the data elicited through a survey can be most useful for developing a description of the extent of internationalization in a large number of institutions, such as those that represent the membership of AASCU. To achieve the latter, the survey data on each institution were carefully evaluated and combined with any other insights gained through consultation or written information and the institution was placed in one of five categories devised to measure the degree of development or emphasis on international programs. The categorization of each institution was a judgmental decision made by the author on the basis of the total knowledge available to him about each institution through the survey, related data, and direct professional experience. The major criteria weighed to establish the degree of internationalization are described in Table 1. It is clear that the author is in favor of substantially higher commitment to and performance in international education, but a clarification needs to be made about Category V. It is not meant to be necessarily superior to Categories III or IV. Category V simply represents those institutions that have active educational cooperation programs with the less developed countries, and without which would have been placed in Categories III or IV.

On the basis of the data obtained and the categorizations of the author, a number of tables have been constructed to present specific comparisons (see Tables II-XIV, which appear together at the end of this section). These tables are introduced by an interpretative commentary.

Commentary on Data Results

The Spread of AASCU Institutions in Categories: With reference to Table I it should be noted that 142 institutions, or 53.8% of the total sample, fall in Categories I and II. A comparison with data collected in 1976[2] shows that a substantial number of institutions have moved from Category I to Category II; however, a shift from the two lower categories to the upper three has not taken place. To deepen the degree of internationalization, institutions in Categories I and II should examine ways of moving up to one of the upper categories and those in Categories III, IV, and V should seek ways of refining and strengthening their programs further. The later sections of this study attempt to assist in the pursuit of these objectives.

Distribution of Certain Variables Among the Categories: Table II collapses into one table a number of variables such as the existence of planned international programs, study abroad, and program relations with the less developed countries. This table is meant simply to show the distribution of these variables among the five categories. A discussion of the significance of these variables and recommendations for future institutional planning efforts will be offered in later sections of this report.

---

[2]Not reproduced here. See American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *op. cit.* p. 14.

TABLE I

OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONALIZATION OF AASCU MEMBER INSTITUTIONS (1981)

Category	No. of Institutions	% of Total Respondents	Degree of Internationalization
I	37	14.0	Usually no visible international activity in the curriculum, mostly western-oriented courses, very little or no study abroad, few or no foreign students, no office of international programs, no committee, no plans.
II	105	39.8	More evidence of activity in international than in Category I. Occasional organized curricular offerings in international areas but less than a minor, more interest in study abroad and foreign students than Category I. Sometimes, an office of international programs.
III	44	16.7	More international activity than in Categories I and II. Planned international curriculum for minors, study abroad, foreign students, often faculty abroad and foreign faculty on campus. Frequently, an office of international programs.
IV	59	22.3	More international activity than in Categories I, II, and III. Planned international curriculum for majors (e.g., international and foreign area studies), usually some exotic languages, study abroad, foreign students, faculty abroad, and foreign faculty on campus. Frequently, an office of international programs.
V	19	7.2	More international activity than in Categories I and II. Elements of III or IV plus international development cooperation programs with less developed countries. Most frequently, an office of international programs.
TOTAL	264	100	

The Seeking of Grants and Success Rate: Table III quite convincingly shows that as AASCU institutions move up through the categories they are more likely to take the initiative in seeking grants and their chance of succeeding is greater. It is in fact impressive that in total, some 56.2 percent of the applications made, were successful. It is clear that more institutions should be encouraged to plan and implement the seeking of grants in the international area.

Ethnic Studies and International: Table IV might be significant because the existence of programs in ethnic studies was not taken into account in the placement of institutions in different categories. Table IV suggests that institutions that have an interest in international programs also tend to have an interest in ethnic studies. Direct observations on numerous campuses lead the author to suggest also that a potentially fruitful area for the academic planner to probe is the extent to which ethnic studies and international studies can be made to reinforce each other in the curriculum and overall institutional activities.

Institutional Operating Budget and International: The most significant of all the findings of our survey is probably reflected in Table V. The figures here clearly convey the fact that the size of the operating budget of an institution is not necessarily a decisive factor in the degree of internationalization of that institution.

Institutional Location and Size: Contrary to the oft-advanced argument that a rural institution cannot internationalize itself meaningfully, Table VI shows that location is by no means the critical factor. Many AASCU institutions that are rural are in the advanced categories of internationalization. With respect to size, Table VII tends to indicate some relationship between the size of the institutions in the sample and their emergence in the five different categories; one should be aware, however, that some large institutions are in the lower categories of internationalization and that some of the small institutions are in the higher categories.

International Requirements for Graduation, Foreign Languages, and Teaching of English as a Second Language: Table VIII gives in percentages the profile of AASCU institutions in terms of their requirement of foreign languages or international courses for graduation. These requirements generally rise as one moves from the lower to the upper categories. It appears that institutions in Category II emphasize a foreign language requirement in the absence of a more structured international program. It further appears that in some cases (see Categories II, III, and IV) international courses can be substituted for language requirements, and vice versa.

Table XI shows that French (261) and Spanish (261) seem to be taught at almost all 264 AASCU institutions, followed closely by German (239). Frequently taught but well below that level are Russian (88), Italian (78), Latin (65), Chinese (44), Japanese (37), and Portuguese (33).[3] Some dis-

[3]As a matter of interest, it should be noted that 48.1 percent of the chief executives whose institutions constituted our survey sample had a fair degree of skill in at least one foreign language including Danish, Finnish, Indonesian, Lithuanian, Norwegian,Portuguese, Polish, Russian, Slovak, and even Tagalog!

cussion and recommendations with respect to the curricular approaches to foreign language and international studies will be offered later in this report.

With respect to the existence of programs of English as a Second Language, Table XIII clearly shows that the incidence of these programs rises steadily with the categories of internationalization. Since an increase in the number of foreign students on campus is, in the author's view, one of the ways of defining internationalization, (see Table I) it is not surprising that institutions with increasing numbers of foreign students would consider the desirability of creating programs of English as a Second Language.

Summary: The data and comments thus far presented have been partly descriptive, i.e., outlining the existing status of internationalization in AASCU institutions, and partly suggestive, i.e., explaining the need to examine more systematically ways of internationalizing the curriculum and the total institution. Sections 2, 3, and 4 will expand on ways to attain the latter critical objectives.

Survey Results

Specific survey results are presented in Tables II-XIV, which follow.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN VARIABLES, BY CATEGORY

Category	% with an Office of Int'l Prog.	% with Full-Time Director of Office	% with Committee on Int'l Prog.	% Sponsoring Study Abroad Programs	% with Program Relations with LDCs	No. of Planned Int'l Curricula* (Major-Minors-Others)
I	0.0	0.0	13.5	13.5	0.0	3
II	38.1	22.5	38.1	61.0	4.8	17
III	52.3	26.1	56.8	79.5	13.6	59
IV	64.4	44.7	64.4	74.6	18.6	118
V	78.9	87.5	73.7	89.5	100.0	23
For All Categories Combined	43.9	33.1	46.2	62.5	15.5	220

*The figures in this column are given in absolute numbers and represent programs and not percentages or institutions because several institutions have more than one such program (e.g., the simultaneous presence of a minor in Latin American Studies, African Studies, and International Studies).

TABLE III

EFFORTS IN SEEKING GRANTS AND SUCCESS RATE, BY CATEGORY

Category	Percentage Application Rate	Percentage Success Rate*
I	10.8	25.0
II	18.1	42.1
III	40.9	55.6
IV	59.3	57.1
V	68.4	84.6
Total Sample	33.7	56.2

*Percentages in this column refer to the percentage of those institutions that applied, for example, the 25% success rate for Category I means that one-fourth of those who applied (10.8%) actually received a grant.

Note: The above data represent the aggregate response as to whether the institutions applied in the previous three years for a grant in the international/ intercultural area to a U.S. government agency, a business corporation, or a private foundation.

TABLE IV

EXISTENCE OF ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAMS, BY CATEGORY

Category	Percentage with Ethnic Studies Programs
I	5.4
II	22.9
III	43.2
IV	52.5
V	63.1
Total Sample	33.3

TABLE V

OPERATING BUDGET OF INSTITUTION, BY CATEGORY

Budget	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Category V	% of Total Sample
< 3 million	32.4%	10.5%	11.4%	1.7%	10.5%	11.7
≥ 3 ≤ 10 million	59.5%	45.7%	22.7%	10.2%	10.5%	33.3
≥ 11 ≤ 20 million	5.4%	27.6%	36.4%	37.3%	10.5%	26.9
≥ 21 ≤ 30 million	2.7%	11.4%	15.9%	25.4%	26.3%	15.2
≥ 31 ≤ 40 million	0.0%	1.9%	4.6%	8.5%	21.1%	4.9
≥ 41 million	0.0%	2.9%	9.1%	17.0%	21.1%	8.0

TABLE VI

CITY SIZE OF INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION, BY CATEGORY

	SMSA Code* (in percentages)								
Category	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Category I	8.1	62.2	8.1	13.5	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4
Category II	6.7	55.2	17.1	7.6	5.7	0.0	1.0	3.8	2.9
Category III	2.3	43.2	11.4	11.4	9.1	0.0	4.5	4.5	13.6
Category IV	1.7	22.0	15.3	13.6	20.3	3.4	1.7	15.3	6.8
Category V	5.3	31.6	15.8	5.3	10.5	0.0	21.1	5.3	5.3
% of TOTAL	4.9	45.1	14.4	10.2	9.5	0.8	3.0	6.1	6.1

*City Size/SMSA – Indicates Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) in which an institution is located.

0 = Not identified

1 = Outside any SMSA

2 = Anywhere within an SMSA of less than 250,000

3 = Anywhere within an SMSA of 250,000 - 499,999

4 = Anywhere within an SMSA of 500,000 - 999,999

5 = in SMSA of 1,000,000 - 1,999,999 outside center city

6 = in SMSA of 1,000,000 - 1,999,999 within center city

7 = in SMSA of 2,000,000 or more outside center city

8 = in SMSA of 2,000,000 or more within center city

TABLE VII

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE, BY CATEGORY

Category	Number of Institutions	Number of Students	
		Average Size	Median
I	37	2,433	1,745
II	105	4,899	3,056
III	44	7,216	6,196
IV	59	10,033	9,733
V	19	13,075	11,964

TABLE VIII

INTERNATIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION, BY CATEGORY

Category	Percentage Requiring Foreign Language	Percentage Requiring International Courses
I	27.0	10.8
II	53.3	11.4
III	45.5	18.2
IV	49.2	32.2
V	68.4	21.1
Total Sample	48.5	17.8

TABLE IX

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THE OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, BY CATEGORY*

	Category					
Functions**	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
1	0	31	18	32	17	98
2	0	29	16	32	17	94
3	0	21	20	23	17	81
4	0	44	22	33	14	113
5	0	37	19	18	14	88
6	0	25	16	20	14	75
7	0	33	15	28	17	93
8	0	21	12	18	11	62
9	0	33	18	29	13	93

*Numbers represent actual totals, not percentages.
**The survey questionnaire covered nine functions:

1–development of collaborative arrangements and contracts with foreign universities and government
2–administration of foregoing arrangements
3–assistance in the internationalization of the curriculum
4–administration of study abroad programs for U.S. students
5–administration of foreign student programs on campus
6–assistance to foreign professors on campus
7–assistance to U.S. professors going overseas
8–interpretation of national developments at the legislative level, in government agencies, and in the private sector with respect to trends and opportunities in international education
9–liaison with the community with respect to citizenship education programs and other programs related to the international/intercultural area.

TABLE X

FORMAL OR INFORMAL INTER-INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN THE U. S., BY CATEGORY

Category	Percentage Having Arrangements
I	10.8
II	41.0
III	59.1
IV	66.1
V	84.2
% of Total Sample	48.5

TABLE XI

LANGUAGES TAUGHT, BY CATEGORY*

	Category					
Language	I	II	III	IV	V	Total
Arabic		5	4	7	3	19
African			3		1	4
Chinese		9	8	23	4	44
French	36	104	43	59	19	261
Farsi					1	1
German	32	100	39	54	14	239
Greek	1	8	4	8	3	24
Italian	1	23	15	30	9	78
Japanese		6	6	19	6	37
Hebrew		3	3	10	7	23
Latin	3	26	16	13	7	65
Portuguese	1	4	4	17	7	33
Russian	1	22	20	36	9	88
Spanish	36	104	43	59	19	261
Scandinavian		5		2		7
Slavic		2	2	2	1	7

*Numbers represent actual totals, not percentages.

TABLE XII

PROFESSIONAL INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF PRESIDENTS, BY CATEGORY

Category	Presidents with Experience*	Percentage
I	13	35.1
II	37	35.2
III	17	38.6
IV	29	49.2
V	12	63.2
Total Sample	108	40.9

*Defined as professional experience overseas as a teacher, consultant, or researcher.

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGE OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, BY CATEGORY

Category	Percentage with Programs
I	8.1
II	41.9
III	61.4
IV	72.9
V	84.2
Total Sample	50.4

TABLE XIV

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF INSTITUTIONS, BY CATEGORY*

	Category				
Regions**	I	II	III	IV	V
Region 1 (North Atlantic)	6	24	15	11	2
Region 2 (Great Lake Plains)	8	24	8	18	4
Region 3 (Southeast)	11	24	12	12	4
Region 4 (West & Southwest)	10	25	7	17	7
Outgoing areas and not codable	2	8	2	1	2
TOTAL	37	105	44	59	19

*Actual totals, not percentages

**Region 1: CT, DE, DC, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT

Region 2: IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI

Region 3: AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV

Region 4: AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OK, OR, TX, UT, WA, WY

2. INTERNATIONALIZING THE CURRICULUM: THE OPTIONS

In approaching the internationalization of the curriculum, a number of options, not necessarily mutually exclusive, need to be considered by each institution in the context of its own make-up, tradition, existing and potential resources, and commitment. The major curricular options that might be considered for adoption, adaptation, or even gradual curricular change are listed below.

The Infusion of Disciplines

It is a truism that most of the content of the standard academic disciplines in the West is western-oriented. The infusion of non-western material is essential to the process of universalization of academic disciplines and, in fact, to the testing and strengthening of theories advanced by the disciplines. It has been seen repeatedly, for example, that economic generalizations that may appear perfectly suitable for the societies of the United States or Western Europe are found to be deficient when applied within the cultural context of Nigeria, Indonesia, or Peru.

Infusing the disciplines with non-western material calls for teachers as well as writers of texts to make a conscious effort to treat that part of the academic discipline in which they are interested on as universal a basis as possible. Obviously, the social sciences and the humanities are included here. This process of infusing the disciplines is slowly taking place, but it needs to be nourished and encouraged. The situation requires the necessary commitment of those in a position to make a sustained and substantial change, namely, teachers and textbooks writers. The title of a course may be identical in two different college catalogs, yet one course might be very parochial and the other almost universal. The difference is the teacher, the degree to which he/she has made a sustained effort to introduce non-western material, and the use of appropriate texts and relative cultural points of view.

Comparative Approaches

These approaches are particularly attractive because they contribute to the unity of the curriculum while providing the means to learn simultaneously about western and non-western cultures and countries. The teacher of sociology who is treating material on family life in the United States and brings in for comparative purposes data and analyses of family life in India and Mexico, for example, has not only internationalized his approach but has also ensured that the student will better understand family life in the American cultural context. Indeed, there is abundant evidence in support of the oft-quoted saying that no one understands his own culture fully unless one can compare it with at least one other culture.

The merits of having students juxtapose the various intellectual and artistic expressions of different societies are enormous, but the obstacle in American higher education seems to have been more the traditional western orientation of the teacher. In courses in the humanities, for example, as F. Champion Ward pointed out long ago:

> There would be no radical novelty or incoherence, and presumably much edification, in instituting such comparisons between, say, the rule of conduct set forth in the Bhagavad Gita and that expounded by Kant, between Machiavelli's theories of statecraft and those of Chanakya, between Iqbal and Nietzsche, Confucius and Montaigne, Aesop and the Panchatantra, the Illiad and the Ramayana, Chartres and Nikko, Pompeii and Petra, the opera according to Peking and that according to Bayreuth.[4]

In the social sciences in the United States, data collected on a wide variety of subjects are still very much nation-centered and therefore western in content. Through comparative approaches social scientists have a most promising opportunity to engage in generalizations based on data collected from a much wider range of human experience. One of the most challenging areas for purposes of research and teaching is that of the process of modernization and social change. The tensions between the forces of tradition and those of modernization represent an enormously fruitful field of inquiry in more than just the ivory tower sense, since these forces are susceptible to redirection and changes in tempo. Indeed, the social sciences seem to generate more enthusiasm when taught, both theoretically and practically, in relation to issues of national development.

The comparative analysis of the impact of the development of science and technology in different societies, developed and otherwise, is another area of investigation critical for purposes of research and teaching. The transfer of science and technology across national boundaries, its adaptation to a variety of cultural environments, evokes a wide range of technical, cross-cultural, and ethical questions, which impinge upon the increasingly complex net of global interrelationships and which deserve the careful attention and sensitization of students and researchers.

It is interesting to note in this context that some 27% of the 300,000 foreign students in the United States are studying engineering and related fields. It is therefore important not only that the U.S. training in these areas be made more relevant to the real conditions these students will be confronting when they return home but also that their technical training not be completely divorced from the sensitivities and analytical skills that the social sciences and the humanities can impart. This issue becomes even more critical from a curricular point of view if one remembers that large numbers of American students currently in science and technology will be increasingly

---

[4] Cited in *The College and World Affairs* (New York: The Hazen Foundation, 1964), pp. 33-34

involved in working in and with the less developed countries through multinational corporations and governmental programs, as well as on a more direct consulting basis. Are American institutions training their students for this increasingly important role?

Issue-Oriented Approaches

It is increasingly obvious that practically all the major issues confronting the world today are not susceptible to serious study or action through a traditional single-discipline approach. These issues, e.g., energy, war and peace, pollution, food, and population growth, are all multidisciplinary in nature. Why not organize part of the curriculum around such issues? The challenge here is to maximize the integration of disciplines in addressing an issue of world moment. The development of such programs requires the type of social engineering on a campus that cuts across departmental lines and the flexibility and leadership necessary to such efforts. Yet, it is clear that these approaches must be seriously considered by those responsible for the curricula on a campus. Should the student be expected to adjust to the presentation of human knowledge into the separate departmental compartments of today's traditional university or should the faculty extend itself to approach academic training with a degree of integration more directly consonant with the condition of man and of the real issues he is confronting around the world?

A mix of disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches in a curriculum aspiring to be of high quality seems to be called for, but its success will depend on the efforts of the faculty members to extend themselves beyond the narrow focus of their respective disciplines and pursue certain topics through a variety of disciplinary lenses. Lest it be inferred that the burden for this curricular enrichment and balance rests entirely with the faculty, it is necessary to add that the leadership of the university at various levels also has a significant role.

As an illustration of such a topical curricular approaches, some observations are offered here on what are generally referred to as peace studies. The theme of social conflict provides an umbrella for the study of international as well as of domestic issues. International social conflict remains one of the perennial problems of mankind and therefore not only deserves the attention of curriculum planners but also provides the framework for much more stimulating teaching than the traditional cataloging of wars as the landmarks of the history of man and civilizations. What does the psychologist have to say about the agressive or non-agressive nature of man? How is man different from animals in behavior under stress? What do the political scientist, the historian, and the economist say about the circumstances that contribute to the escalation of an international conflict or its moderation? What does the philosopher say about the ethical and philosophical considerations of a particular conflict situation?

How much more useful it is to teach and research peace studies in a rigorous academic mold than to expect students who have emerged from the traditional disciplines to "stumble" into sustained skillful professional roles

in peacemaking or simply play their parts as concerned citizens of the world. It is heartening that a number of universities have introduced peace studies as part of their curriculum all the way to the doctoral level and that even a University for Peace under the aegis of the United Nations is being formed in Costa Rica. The issues of war and peace are integrally tied to the conflicting ideologies of free enterprise with various brands of socialism and communism, to the stockpiling of nuclear power, to the depletion of strategic raw materials, to the poverty and malnutrition that afflicts almost two thirds of the world population, and to several other critical concerns that political leaders invoke under the cloak of national security considerations.

To return to the main theme of this section, topical or interdisciplinary approaches deserve increasing emphasis in the curriculum because of the nature of the issues confronting the world. Since faculty members are traditionally more comfortable in their disciplinary habitats and departments, ways of creating the necessary incentives to encourage them to move out into interdisciplinary ventures in teaching and research must be devised. It would be eminently unfair simply to say to them that they must venture at their own risk and that, in effect, they will continue to be evaluated by their departmental peers on the basis of their work within the traditional confines of their discipline. Here again the leadership of the university must, both in terms of intangible encouragement as well as concrete incentives, recognize the efforts of deserving faculty in developing sound interdisciplinary studies, international or otherwise.

Area and Civilization Studies

A rationale can easily be made for an area studies concentration at the undergraduate level as one of the several viable options available to those concerned with the internationalizing the curriculum. For an undergraduate program to offer a minor or even a major in African studies, Latin American studies, Middle East studies, South Asian studies, East Asian studies, etc, has proven to be a most legitimate and sound curricular way of giving the opportunity to interested undergraduates to concentrate on a significant region of the world.

This approach is not necessarily suitable for many undergraduate institutions, however, nor is it easily transferable from an institution where it is successful to another with different resources and commitment. In fact, an area studies concentration of high quality is increasingly difficult to develop in a relatively small undergraduate institution for a variety of reasons. Some of the basic conditions to be met by an undergraduate institution interested in area studies, for example the Middle East, follow:

- Ability of the institution to teach courses on the Middle East in some five or six disciplines, such as history, politics, economics, sociology, philosophy, and literature.

- Ability of the institution to teach the major languages of the area. In the case of the Middle East this means Arabic, Turkish, Persian,

and Hebrew. In the case of Latin America, it means Spanish and Portuguese. To be coupled with the standard language teaching and language laboratory equipment are the services of native speakers able to provide students with the necessary practice and native voice inflections.

- Ability of the institution to provide and maintain library resources (books, journals, and newspapers) essential to backstop a modern area studies program.

On the assumption that an institution wants to start such a program from scratch, an initial annual expenditure of approximately $300,000 dollars (most of which will be recurring annually) must be assumed. Institutions that already have a head start because of the interest of three or four of their faculty plus some library holdings can easily calculate how much they must add to their resource base (human and material) to satisfy the requirements of a reasonably solid area studies program. These comments are directed primarily to undergraduate institutions and need to be modified for institutions that already have relevant resources at the graduate and professional school levels.

Instead of area studies, curricular approaches to significant civilizations and cultures can be undertaken, e.g., a curriculum relating to China, Japan, India, or Islam. The objective here would be to view any of these civilizations as an organic entity with a distinctive history, culture, and social organization. Although organizing such a program represents a challenge, experience has shown that such approaches are most successful when they combine broad chronological coverage with concentration on a selected number of topics. There are also those who favor the comparative approach within Asian societies, for example, and would contrast the experience with Buddhism in China, Japan, and India. The key here, once again, is competent and enthusiastic teaching. The issue of foreign languages in such approaches becomes less critical, but requiring or making available courses in one of the languages of the civilizations studied is not unreasonable.

One of the drawbacks of area or civilizational approaches is that they have not normally been required of all undergraduate students. Hence, there is a good chance that enrollment in such programs may be limited to a relatively small proportion of interested students, and the bulk of the undergraduates manage to graduate without exposure to an international dimension in their studies. It is for this reason that the diffusion of international studies, broadly defined, needs to remain a sustained objective of the undergraduate institution; such diffusion should cut across all departments and professional schools. There has been serious experimentation with general courses in "Asian" or "Oriental" civilization somewhat parallel to the earlier development of western civilization courses, and they are certainly options to be considered in a general education curriculum.

Finally, it is hoped that the adoption by an institution of a concentrated area or civilizational studies approach does not deflect the overall efforts of other faculty from what should be a sustained pursuit, as outlined earlier,

of infusing non-western materials into their disciplines or of using comparative approaches to enrich their own courses cross-culturally.

Intercultural Communication

Whereas cross-cultural implies the comparative, juxtapositional approach, intercultural is meant to cover the contact of two cultures, their collision, their interaction. Such situations create tensions, adjustment, and learning experiences of value to students and researchers alike. The movement of students, teachers, businesspersons, consultants, diplomats, journalists, tourists, and others is a continuous experiment in intercultural communication and discovery.

Marketing techniques in the American cultural context may well fail in the Japanese, French, or Nigerian settings. The symbols and language used and the values projected may alienate or cause misunderstandings about the products to be marketed. The style of conducting business, socializing, eating, drinking, and dealing with different members of host families differs widely and could cause considerable embarrassment, if not business disasters. Sensitivity to other cultures lends itself to both academic and experiential learning. The communication skills already prized within a single cultural context are even more prized when developed and refined across cultural lines. Courses and seminars in intercultural communications can sensitize students in most fields to the processes involved when an individual or a group from a culture touches and penetrates another culture. There is good reason to believe that intercultural experience in the U.S. domestic setting can be most helpful to individuals who subsequently move into a transnational intercultural setting—provided, of course, the knowledge and experience acquired is maximized through careful intellectual analysis and the application of certain principles of deportment and good human relations.

Courses on intercultural communications may analyze the tensions inherent in the collision of cultures in a historical context or may focus on the more immediate needs of those, say engineering or business students, who expect to conduct part of their business in foreign countries. A U.S. journalist cannot report about some aspect of U.S. relations with Mexico or China unless such a journalist is somewhat sensitive to the tensions between the cultures involved and to the symbols and the values that these societies hold. The complicated area of inquiry dubbed "national character" will probably continue to provide us with jokes, yet misperceptions and miscalculations can also cause or escalate international crises and lead to the very antithesis of international understanding.

Especially in a world where travel will increasingly become the rule, it would be a great asset to students to have acquired during their college years some sensitivity to the processes of interaction between cultures and the skills necessary to succeed in their eventual missions, be they in business, the media, government, education, or merely tourists.

There is no reason, of course, why a general curricular approach in intercultural communication could not be accompanied by either a comparative or a regional academic coverage relating to a specific country, region, or

culture. There is also no reason why the international dimension of ethnic studies could not be fruitfully explored. In fact, it makes good sense from a curricular point of view for appropriate undergraduate institutions to examine carefully the points of intersection and reinforcement in general education, international studies and ethnic studies (see the results of Table IV and subsequent commentary).

The greatest value of both intercultural and cross-cultural studies remains that of helping students transcend their own cultural conditioning. For the student to learn academically and experientially that his viewpoint is "cultural" rather than "natural" is very important. For the educator to be able to stimulate the learning of his students from the world rather than only about the world is critical.

International Development: Study and Practice

If one of the most, if not the most, important challenges to the survival of mankind is the worsening poverty and malnutrition of two-thirds of the population of the world, should not the study of the means to combat the crises caused by such conditions be considered by some institutions worthy of a place in the undergraduate curriculum? It is on these conditions that the conflict of world political ideologies is feeding as the armaments race continues unabated and as the gap between the developed and developing countries widens.

Indeed, not all institutions can or should establish a major or minor in international development studies. The general issues involved here can certainly be touched on through several of the curricular approaches outlined above. There is, however, an international development activity that is quite deep, and its choice by some academic planners as a concentration at the undergraduate level is justifiable. It is also a professional field that should attract the theoretician and practitioner alike at the master's and doctoral level. The field of *development* of human and material resources is of primary concern to every single less developed country (LDC). The more developed countries, such as the United States, Western Europe, and Japan, have enormous stakes in appreciating its nature and assisting in such development. The expertise, the financial capital, the technology, the infrastructure needed for full development are often lacking in the LDCs. The industrialized countries and such international institutions as the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, and several agencies of the United Nations, have a major role to play in development in cooperation with the developing countries. The skills and expertise required span the gamut of human knowledge and inventiveness, but the real challenge is the adjustment to and creation of new techniques particularly suited to local physical, societal, and cultural conditions. Whether we are talking about agriculture in arid lands or public health delivery in rural areas, the challenge is staggering. International development is certainly not a science in the traditional sense, but it is a vast field requiring sustained academic training of an interdisciplinary nature.

If adopted by a university in its curriculum, it serves the double purpose of promoting the global knowledge and awareness of students exposed to it

as well as of providing the institution with more credibility in relating conceptually and operationally with the less developed countries in promoting the development programs of the latter. AASCU institutions that aspire to belong to Category V as defined earlier for purposes of tabulating survey data should have a special stake in this curricular area.

The International Studies Major or Minor

This curricular approach is quite popular and because of its flexibility it has been implemented by a number of institutions. A typical design requires the student to take a certain number of courses to satisfy the international studies concentration of that institution. These courses might include a cluster of offerings in international relations, international economics, international organization, aspects of intercultural communication, a particular area emphasis (e.g., Africa, Middle East, Southeast Asia) with relevant courses in a variety of disciplines plus, sometimes, an appropriate language. As expected, an international studies major or minor is usually based in the social sciences and the humanities and may vary from a loose unstructured program to a structured curriculum culminating in a senior seminar or a senior thesis on an individually selected and approved topic, or both. In an institution requiring 128 credits for graduation, an international studies major might be expected to take 32 credits that can be categorized as international studies.

Quite often, the international studies concentrations or areas studies approach at the undergraduate level essentially represent a combination of courses in a number of disciplines rather than a structured interdisciplinary approach to certain issues. A certain degree of curricular integration is attempted through team teaching, senior seminars, and research papers. Internships, as possible, in such organizations as the United Nations, multinational corporations, international private voluntary organizations, and study-abroad programs can serve to supply an important experiential learning component to international studies.

With reference to the current experience in AASCU institutions, the data collected show as many as 43 categories of planned programs, which can be classified as majors, minors, or some other form of structured international curriculum. The full listing of these 43 categories would serve no purpose, but it might be useful to indicate the frequency of some of the more significant categories:

Major, Minor, or Program in	Frequency
International Studies/Relations	47
Asian Studies	30
European Studies (including East Europe)	14
Latin American Studies	58
Middle East Studies	5
African Studies	7
Afro-American Studies	8
Third World Studies	3

The high frequency of the Latin American concentration is not surprising, but the fact that only five institutions have chosen a Middle East emphasis or 15 institutions only offer African or Afro-American studies courses is surprising. Incidentally, the two categories, African studies and Afro-American studies, were kept statistically separate because it is not always clear to what extent Afro-American studies are internationally oriented. In relation to the Latin American studies programs, it should also be noted that all 58 institutions offer Spanish but only 15 offer Portuguese! In view of the growing importance of Brazil, this limited instruction in Portuguese for students who have chosen a Latin American concentration in their studies might be a handicap.

Also, institutions that do not have an organized study program in the international area quite often have a few courses which, while not related to each other programmatically in the curriculum, are international in content. Extensive observation, however, suggests that the processes of infusing disciplines with non-western materials and of promoting comparative international approaches and interdisciplinary studies in the international area thrive best in a campus atmosphere with visible and organized commitments in the curricular and extracurricular areas.

General Comments on Undergraduate Curricular Planning in International Studies

Recently, a number of reports[5] deploring the parochialism of the United States in foreign languages and international studies have appeared. These reports call for much more vigorous internationalization of education at all levels through international studies and foreign languages. The previous pages have attempted to identify a number of options available to undergraduate curriculum planners. However, the real challenge, nationwide, remains that of *democratizing international education* so that it ceases to be considered a luxury or elitist in character. The democratization of international education at the undergraduate level is critical and so are its radiations to the community. International education does not mean some courses in international relations here and there or a few American students abroad or a few foreign students here. Instead, it refers to a dimension that transcends schools at all levels, the community and the U.S. citizenry in general. It refers to *global attitudes* and *perspectives*, to the acquisition of *knowledge* about the world, and to the development of *international-intercultural sensitivity*. To pursue such objectives the institution must view

[5]President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *Strength Through Wisdom, A Critique of U.S. Capability*, November 1979; Paul Simon, *The Tongue-Tied American* (New York: Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1980); *Toward Education with a Global Perspective*, a Report of the National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1980; Council on Learning, *What College Students Know and Believe About Their World* (New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1981).

the internationalization of the campus as an integral part of its mission and commitment and must in turn reflect this priority in its undergraduate curriculum.

In weighing options, therefore, the objectives of the institution need to be carefully assessed. If the institution wishes to "touch" all its undergraduates internationally, it should promote such approaches as the infusion of non-western materials in several disciplines and the comparative approaches to cultural and other conditions in different societies. In short, the international dimension should permeate at least the general education offerings.

If a topical or area studies orientation is adopted, the challenge is to diffuse this interest as much as possible throughout the entire institution, especially into the professional schools, in addition to promoting the infusion of non-western materials and comparative approaches in the disciplines. To illustrate, an undergraduate institution offering a major in Latin American studies would be remiss in not ensuring that its business school include courses concerned with business in Latin America, that its foreign language department include courses in Spanish and Portuguese, or that its engineering school address the application of science and technology in the Latin American context. It is through such reinforcements across departments and schools that the mission of the institution is optimally implemented with a substantial multiplier effect in quality and opportunities. Such an institution should favor student exchanges with Latin America and seek opportunities for faculty exchanges and institutional linkages with Latin America.

If a topical approach is adopted, such as "peace and conflict studies," it is critical that it be as interdisciplinary as possible and include the involvement of faculty from the social sciences, humanities, natural sciences, and professional schools. Incidentally, institutions should consider introducing as a general requirement for graduation at least one course or seminar clearly identified as relating to the non-western world (e.g., Politics of the Middle East, Economics of Africa, Religions of Asia, Brazilian Society and Culture, the Dynamics of North-South Relations).

The offering of foreign languages on AASCU campuses is certainly an important curricular issue that each institution should review carefully. The "why," the "which," and the "how" of teaching foreign languages should be addressed as well as their integration in the total curriculum. It is regrettable that enrollments in foreign languages on a national basis have been dropping at the secondary and collegiate levels, thus aggravating the parochialism and other negative consequences that U.S. international education is attempting to diminish.[6] The President's Commission reports:

- Only 15 percent of American high school students now study a foreign language—down from 24 percent in 1965. The decline continues.
- Only one out of 20 public high school students studies French, German, or Russian beyond the second year. (Four years is considered a minimum prerequisite for useable language competence).

[6]See Simon, *op. cit.*

- Only 8 percent of American colleges and universities now require a foreign language for admission, compared with 34 percent in 1966."[7]

An ETS Survey reports that there was no correlation between learning foreign languages and acquiring global knowledge![8]

The entire foreign language area seems in need of review and revitalization in terms of objectives, methodology, integration in the curriculum and inter-institutional cooperation. Surely, students would be more strongly motivated to learn if the mechanical acquisition of language skill were accompanied by insights into the cultural dynamics of the people to whom the language primarily relates. Surely, a student majoring in business would be more stimulated and more marketable if he combined his concentration with some knowledge of Latin America and of Spanish. Curricula that promote the integration of programs with the humanities as well as between the humanities and the social sciences and the professional schools in the international area would certainly benefit the students. Admittedly, an important job must be done at the K-12 level, but postsecondary teachers might well be able to assist their colleagues at that level as well as work directly to make the undergraduate curriculum even richer and more meaningful. Such exotic languages as Arabic, Chinese, or Japanese cannot be taught by most institutions because of financial and other considerations, but if the availability of such languages and many others is considered desirable by the academic planners, should not inter-institutional arrangements be explored that offer access to these languages? Should we not also promote the study of, and development of achievements tests in, certain languages which are not taught formally at the institution but which are available through tutorial arrangements?

To be able to speak or understand, even if not fluently, a foreign language is in itself intellectually and esthetically rewarding in keeping with the cultivation of the mind and the liberal arts tradition. It is critical that institutions not allow a vocation-oriented market to deny their students the opportunity to enrich themselves through the humanities in general and in particular through one language other than English. The foreign language issue, including requiring a foreign language for graduation, has complex ramifications that each institution should consider in its own unique setting; nevertheless, the conclusions of the National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies are noteworthy:

> Although English is widely used in the world, Americans who rely on that fact are hampered in international discourse, whether it be for diplomatic, business, or cultural reasons. More Americans must learn to converse with citizens of other nations in their own languages. The inability to do this inhibits

---

[7]President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *op.cit.*

[8]Council on Learning, *op. cit.*

communication and understanding and implies arrogance. The United States itself is becoming a multilingual society. Americans should work towards making America a nation in which all citizens become proficient in more than one language.

The Assembly urges that higher education work toward realization:

- that all college graduates achieve functional competency in speaking, listening to, reading, writing, and understanding a second language;
- that language skills be measured in terms of proficiency levels rather than units of time spent in a classroom;
- that national standard measures be developed by the relevant professions as a first step to gauging proficiency levels;
- that colleges and universities encourage foreign language study throughout the disciplines, but particularly in programs with an international orientation or character, such as history, economics, political science, or anthropology;
- that higher education recognize its responsibility to encourage and assist the improvement of language teaching in elementary and secondary schools; and
- that language study be developed in combination with related fields, using, among other things, double majors, language concentrations with other majors, or language minors.[9]

[9] *Toward Education with a Global Perspective, op. cit.*

3. INTERNATIONALIZING THE INSTITUTION

The Need for Planning and Consensus-Building

With regard to the process of internationalizing a university, the following questions are often raised: Whose responsibility on campus is it? Where do you start? Can it be done without external funding? Some negative undertones are evident in such other questions as: Can we do anything with a commuter urban institution? Should we try to do anything with a small rural institution removed from the cosmopolitan contacts of a metropolis? Some pessimistic statements are also heard on occasion: Our students are not interested in things international. Our faculty does not care. Our president or vice president for academic affairs is against it. We do not believe in the value of this travel junketeering overseas by students or faculty!

Fortunately, for each of the pessimists there are dozens of enthusiasts at the faculty and administrative levels who are making a substantial contribution to quality education. The tracing of historical successes of higher education institutions in the international area shows repeatedly that the initiative and efforts of some faculty members with assistance at the leadership levels have moved entire institutions in the international area, irrespective of location, size, or budget.[10] On the basis of the data reviewed earlier in this study and of direct experience with numerous colleges and universities of all types, sizes, and locations, it is fair to conclude that the degree of internationalization of a campus is not a function of size, location, or overall budget. *In the last analysis it is a function of faculty competence and commitment and of institutional leadership.*

The faculty is undoubtedly the key to academic content change. The President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and other appropriate policy leaders should act as orchestra leaders, harmonizers, catalysts, and stimulators, but it is the faculty's efforts in their individual courses, in interdisciplinary teaching and research, and in impacting the overall curriculum that will internationalize a campus. Fortunately, not all the faculty members have to play in the orchestra. It is the author's estimate that having 25% of the faculty committed to a serious international dimension is sufficient to move the campus significantly in the international area. In concert with this faculty support the leadership needs to ensure that an institutional commitment to the international dimension is carefully developed, discussed, and implemented.

For campuses not at an advanced stage of development and articulation of their international role, a first step is for the President or the Provost/

---

[10]See: Education and World Affairs, *The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities*, New York: Walker and Company, 1965; American Association of State Colleges and Universities, *op. cit.*

Vice President for Academic Affairs to appoint an institutionwide committee to study the international mission of the institution. Systematically taking stock of views, resources, and potential is essential to the consensus-building process necessary to identify and implement the international needs of the institution. There is no reason why this committee could not have administrators on it as well, but it is important to anticipate that the chairman will need to present a number of recommendations for review and discussion by the faculty and the administration. The chairman should be generally respected by the university constituency. The participation of one or two qualified students on such a committee is also a possibility. Based on a meeting every three to four weeks, the work of subgroups, intensive consultations within the campus, and possibly a visit by an external consultant, it will probably take about six months for the committee to complete its report. Numerous institutions have found it useful to charge such a committee with the mandate suggested in AASCU's policy statement[11] "The International Responsibility of Higher Education," which states the following:

The mandate that emerges for higher education is compelling. We urge that, irrespective of its student composition, size, or location, each college and university consider seriously within its normal governance structure the following questions:

1. Does its current undergraduate curriculum reflect the implications of interdependence? Are the "international" and "intercultural" components of its curriculum an integral part of a total institutional plan, or an uneven and fragmented assortment of interests.

2. What ought to be the "international" role of the institution on campus and externally? What is the best way to examine and to plan such a role?

3. What is the status of its resources, human and material, in international studies? How can it strengthen these without additional funding? What is it that it must do that requires additional funding?

4. Has it considered curricular alternatives in such fields as area studies, inter-disciplinary and comparative studies, cross-cultural education, etc. . .? What is the potential of the outreach programs in the international areas?

5. Is it making full use of opportunities for faculty development? How can it develop other opportunities in this area? Does it have provision for visiting foreign students?

[11]This policy statement was adopted by the membership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities during its 15th annual meeting, November, 1975, Boston, Massachusetts.

6. What is its policy on admission and training of foreign students? Is it making full use of their presence?

7. Is it making full use of opportunities for its students to study and to work in a foreign society?

8. Has it considered the possibility and value of inter-institutional cooperation and consortia arrangements both within and outside the United States in fulfilling its program objectives?

9. Has its Board of Trustees (or its equivalent) seriously considered the international role and responsibility of the institution? How about its State Commission on Higher Education? Its state legislators?

10. What is its policy in international education in relation to "continuing education" groups, the business community, the media, the government, and K to 12 public education?

It is undoubtedly better for an institution to regard internationalization as a mutually reinforcing package of programs rather than the fragmented approach that too frequently characterizes campus activities. For example, the strategies chosen to internationalize the curriculum should have a bearing on the types of students and faculty exchanges to be promoted or on the linkages to be contemplated with other countries. Faculty development efforts in the international area should be seriously encouraged. Funding efforts should be based on the mission and commitment of the institution. The interaction of the institution with the K-12 group in the community as well as with business and industry should also reflect the institution's commitment and direction. What may in the past have been a haphazard admissions policy for foreign students might well take into account the optimal balance of foreign students at different levels and in different disciplines and professional fields to assist in the overall mission and educational strategies of the institution.

An institution needs to build on its existing resources, human and material, in the international area and should identify areas of special curricular and programmatic interest rather than respond merely to the occasional fragmented opportunities, which may present themselves. Inter-institutional arrangements, formal and informal, should be seriously considered to maximize services to the students and minimize costs to all. The sharing of resources in training, research, and public service in the international area is not only substantively and professionally advisable but has increasingly become a financial necessity.

Establishing Exchanges

Exchanges should be viewed as a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. The term exchanges is used here to cover the full two-way flow of faculty, students, and administrators across national boundaries for teaching,

research, study, and consulting purposes rather than to imply the specific swapping of individuals between certain institutions. International exchanges of faculty make it possible for hundreds of individuals each year to obtain new cultural perspectives, to strengthen their research and teaching expertise in other societies, and to develop direct contacts with their colleagues in other countries. The international movement of students is also a time-honored means of acquiring training in other cultures or exposure to special academic programs and individual scholars.

The international movement of faculty and students represents a concrete means of assisting in the internationalization of a university above and beyond whatever other purposes these individuals might serve in the context of teaching, research, and public service.

The 1979-80 IIE census[12] reported that there were 286,340 foreign students from 185 countries and territories residing in the United States; this represents a steady annual increase from 34,232 in 1954-55. About 60 percent of these are at the undergraduate level, including approximately 12 percent who are candidates for an associate degree and 33 percent who are enrolled at the graduate level. The areas of origin of the students are Africa (12.6%), Asia (57.8%), Europe (7.9%), Latin America (14.8%), North America (5.4%) and Oceania (1.4%). The number of students from OPEC countries was about 100,000 in 1979-80, almost double what it was there years earlier. The concentration of foreign students in certain areas is important for future planning: engineering (16.9%), business and management (16.4%), social sciences (7.9%), natural and life sciences (7.6%), mathematics and computer sciences (5.4%), fine and applied arts (5.0%), education (4.3%), humanities (4.0%), health professions (3.8%), agriculture (3.1%), other fields and English as a second language (15.6%). Projections for the future vary widely but suggest that the number of foreign students coming to the United States will continue to increase, perhaps doubling within a decade.

The policy issues confronting U.S. institutions of higher learning regarding foreign students are numerous and must be addressed by each institution assisted as possible by information and guidance from a number of national agencies. Although there is little doubt in most quarters that the presence of foreign students is an asset to American higher education, such developments as the Iranian student crises[13] or the inquiries of legislators into the expenditures of public funds on foreign students have created some

---

12 Institute of International Education, *Open Doors: 1979/80, Report on International Exchange*, New York, 1981.

13 Issues which plagued many universities in 1980 had to do with the sudden inability of thousands of Iranian students to pay their fees. The problem was quite acute for institutions with large numbers of Iranian students and raised the policy issue as to whether the presence of such large numbers of Iranians was the result of a conscious policy of the institution. To a certain extent Nigerian students also presented a fiscal problem in 1979-80.

anxieties and confusion. It seems important, therefore, that each institution of higher learning review and revitalize its rationale for having foreign students and then answer for itself a series of policy and administrative questions. There seems to be a cluster of arguments for having foreign students in U.S. universities as opposed to any single rationale. Among the most compelling are that foreign students enrich American students through cultural interaction, that U.S. universities represent resources which should provide opportunities for education and professional development to the most promising individuals regardless of their country of origin, that it is the moral responsibility of the more advanced nations to help train the nationals of the underdeveloped areas, and that training foreign students in the United States makes potential good friends for the United States around the world.

Despite the vast literature in the field of international exchange[14] and regardless of the rationales offered for the training of foreign students, the receiving institution needs to re-examine at the policy and administrative levels at least such questions as:

1. In what ways should it modify any part of its curriculum to meet the needs of foreign students?

2. How can it maximize the enrichment of its curricular and non-curricular offerings through the presence of foreign students?

3. How many foreign students should it admit from each country or region of the world and at what levels? What are to be the overall criteria for admission?

4. Does it have the academic offerings and administrative infrastructure to satisfy the objectives of individual foreign student applicants and their counseling?

5. What is to be its follow-up role with its foreign student alumni over the years?

An excellent resource to consult in this area is the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA) which provides free consultation on campus on a variety of issues concerning foreign students, including admission, teaching English as a second language, community relations, and general services for foreign students. NAFSA has considerable expertise in these

---

[14]See, for example, Seth Spaulding and Michael J. Flack, *The World's Students in the United States*, New York, Praeger, 1976., which reviewed some 550 publications and studies on international education exchange and foreign students.

areas and makes its services available free of charge, thanks to a grant from the Department of State.[15]

Areas of policy concern include allegations that some universities are primarily interested in foreign students because of budget considerations. Ironically, some legislators carried away by the mood of fiscal austerity engulfing most sectors of U.S. society have even suggested that foreign students be charged higher fees than out-of-state students or that their numbers be curtailed! There is a real danger that some individuals in a position to influence decisions concerning the overall flow of foreign students may not fully appreciate the value of these students to the American educational process or the international responsibility of U.S. universities and colleges. For these reasons as well, it is critical that institutions of higher learning think through their rationale for admitting foreign students and justify their policies as necessary.

The presence of foreign students in the United States has been shown to be beneficial to the U.S. economy; the expenditures of foreign students for living costs alone for the academic year 1980-81 reached an impressive $1,283,389,326.[16] A statement[17] issued by the International Education Exchange Liaison Group in May 1981 represents an eloquent attempt to correlate the value of international education exchange and the national security interests of the United States. It refers to the International Communication Agency as "A Second Line of Defense," gives statistics to show that the United States is not competitive with many other countries in sponsoring exchanges, and illustrates the value of U.S. government funding as a maior catalvst for the private sector. With the shift of some federal funding to the states, it would also be legitimate to examine the and stimulate responsibility of the states to foster international education exchanges.

Some 25,000 U.S. students are reported[18] to have been abroad in 1980-81 under the sponsorship of 813 programs based in U.S. colleges and universities. It should be noted however, that about 17,400 (or 70%) of the U.S. students abroad under such sponsorship were in Europe! Although there are many more students who, because they go on their own, are not included in these statistics, the total flow of U.S. students abroad is dismally low,

---

15 Those interested in applying for a consultant should write to: Associate Director for Professional Development, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

16 Institute of International Education, *op.cit.*, p. 57.

17 Unpublished statement entitled "Enhancing American Influence Abroad: International Exchanges in the National Interest", May 1981 (available through IIELG, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009).

18 Institute of International Education, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-166.

compared, for example, with the percentage of foreign students in the United States. Legitimate questions[19] need to be asked by institutions of higher learning:

1. How can we best relate study abroad programs to the mission and academic programs of the institution in the international area?

2. Are we sponsoring the right types of students for study abroad, in the right country, for the right program?

3. Should we steer more students to the developing countries? Can we relate such programs to international development activities of the U.S. institution abroad?

4. Should we introduce more experiential learning and work-related study abroad programs?

5. How can we assist in the financing of study abroad for students of very modest means?

6. How can we maximize the impact of returning students on the home campus?

7. How can we best evaluate the individual experience abroad as well as the long term implications for the institution?

A study of numbers of U.S. faculty abroad reveals that, irrespective of the objectives of such faculty, usually research, teaching and consulting, the financial support for such movement has been eroding seriously. The U.S. support for The Fulbright Program, a major vehicle for the exchange of professors between the United States and other countries has de facto been reduced by about 50 percent during the last decade because of cuts and inflation. The general trend for several governmental agencies and foundations has been referred to as "U.S. intellectual disarmament" and is vastly deplored. Yet, while pressing for more funding from the public and private sectors for faculty exchanges, it should be noted that the changes occurring in many societies and their economies are also providing increasing opportunities for faculty exchanges at minimal cost. For instance, an increasing number of opportunities are available for professors on sabbatical (who receive all or part of their pay from their home institutions) to teach or join in research overseas with some local assistance for housing and meals.

---

19 See also *Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad*, New York, Council on International Education Exchange, 1965 and *Evaluating Academic Programs Abroad;* New York, Council on International Education Exchange, 1978.

Although travel remains a problem, it may not be excessive for small families, except when long distances are involved. Many institutions with an increasing commitment to internationalizing the campus assist their faculty with some travel support through their office of international programs.

Faculty development opportunities overseas should be promoted whenever possible to satisfy the individual study and research needs of faculty, but priority should be given to those opportunities overseas that reflect a curricular emphasis and commitment of the institution or that result from institutional planning and arrangements made for international development cooperation with universities and agencies abroad. Thus, a U.S. university with a focus on Latin America should facilitate and favor the movement of its faculty to Latin America without, however, closing the door to serious individual proposals aimed at other parts of the world, which quite often do not depend on home institution financial support.

The concept of reciprocity, as opposed to traditional technical assistance programs, with both developed and less developed countries augurs well for a freer and more flexible flow of faculty internationally. U.S. universities need to promote suitable opportunities to assist faculty in their teaching and research and maximize their contribution upon return to the central international mission of the institution. In turn, individual faculty members interested in professional travel overseas might be encouraged to exert serious efforts within their teaching and research to internationalize their courses and contribute to the overall international thrust of the institution.

The U.S. University and International Development

This topic is touched on here because many smaller colleges and universities, and even larger ones, find it difficult to develop meaningful linkages with the less developed countries. This is sometimes due to the lack of appropriate resources or to the excessive zeal of university representatives wishing to offer the services of their institution abroad without being sufficiently knowledgeable about or sensitive to the priorities of certain societies or the cultural and psychological dimensions involved in establishing a mutually fruitful relationship with these societies. More often than not, it is the lack of information and contacts.

It is also important to realize that although international development donors may wish to utilize U.S. colleges and universities as resource capabilities for the implementation of international development objectives in less developed countries, these donors are not primarily concerned with service to or the strengthening of U.S. universities. Instead, they are primarily interested in, and often limited by charter to, the pursuit of a certain set of international development objectives. Hence, the need for the individual U.S. college and university to clarify its rationale for possible involvement in each program and its relationship to the overall mission of the institution is critical.

It should also be noted that the more serious challenge confronting higher education in the developing world (and one that implicates U.S. universities desirous of cooperation in international development programs) is the allega-

tion that many universities in the developing countries are not addressing the international development priorities of the country, that instead of transforming economies they are becoming too expensive to support, that instead of benefiting all the people many have become elitist "islands of privilege in a sea of poverty." The shorthand adopted by several donor agencies in the last few years in relation to development has been aid to "the poorest of the poor." The U. S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has certainly adopted this core priority and a number of development aid agencies around the world such as Overseas Development Ministry in Britain, the Canadian International Development Agency, and the World Bank have done so also.

The leadership of the World Bank has often claimed that economic growth was not equitably reaching the poor and that the poor were not significantly contributing to growth in the less developed countries. The president of the World Bank outlined the basic needs that must be met if poverty is to be overcome: food with sufficient nutritional value, shelter and clothing, education, clean water, and health care. While extolling the virtues of education as an activity that can accelerate overall development, the most recent World Bank report on education states:

> What education can do, however, is constrained by, among other things, the prevailing economic order, political power, and social structure. Education is certainly most effective in settings in which several interrelated policies and programs fostering social and economic improvement are simultaneously at work. . . One must think of education, therefore, not only as a "sector" of development—parallel, for example, to agriculture or industry—but as a pervasive element that must be integrated—horizontally and vertically—into all development efforts.[20]

Increasingly, students of development stress the fact that development should no longer be considered an economic process or one measured only by economic indices such as per capita gross national product (GNP). Much more refined and integrated indices have been developed to assess changes in the quality of life in a society. Such concepts as a sense of "moral direction," "cultural continuity," "self-image," "social equity," and a capacity to relate economic and social goals to moral objectives are increasingly identified as critical elements in serious and sustained development efforts. Proponents of these views consider that LDC universities should, as part of their mandate, interpret and shape attitudes in their societies in relation to development, as well as being involved in training, research, and other aspects of development implementation.

The dilemma of the LDC university has been well summed up:

---

20 World Bank, *Education Sector Policy Paper,* Washington, D.C., World Bank, 1980, Third Edition, April 1980, p. 14.

> The universities must not only be capable of responding to internal developmental problems of poverty and inequality, they must also be capable of responding to problems of dependency. Granted, the need to respond more effectively to the internal problems of development is very urgent, and a great deal more should be done in this direction, both conceptually and operationally; however, a study that concentrated on this aspect alone would inevitably leave itself open to the accusation, however unjust, of wanting to downgrade LDC universities and to close their access to the real sources of wealth and power of industrial countries thus keeping the developing countries as pastoral societies. The great problem the developing countries face is how to adjust their universities to these two goals—internal well-being and external independence—that lie in opposite directions, and how to do so within a single university system.[21]

The above comments are meant to serve as general background to assist institutions exploring areas of international development cooperation. There seems to be a growing realization on the part of LDC universities that their historic tendency to model themselves after their former colonial mentors, be they British, French, Dutch or American, should be revised in favor of a more indigenous system, eclectic in nature and incorporating features from a diversity of foreign systems. These LDC universities also seem to be realizing that the linking up with prestigious universities may not be as advantageous to them as cooperation with institutions experienced with and committed to regional development. The fact is that AASCU-type institutions are in many cases closer to the needs of LDC universities than some of the prestigious universities with which international affiliations have been traditional. It is also clear that international educational relations should stress the concepts of reciprocity and mutual respect as opposed to some of the more paternalistic relationships of the past that have evoked images of cultural imperialism.

Formal, large-scale institutional linkages, such as those sponsored by USAID and the British InterUniversity Council in the last two decades, are not the only means to effect international development cooperation and are in fact diminishing. New patterns of flexible and sometimes quite informal cooperative linkages between universities, consortia, and associations are emerging to suit changing needs and relationships. The financial crisis besetting higher education everywhere means that more professors on sabbatical who do not have to be paid full salaries plus other expenses need to be

---

[21] Soetjatmoko, "Higher Education and Development: An Overview," in Kenneth W. Thompson, Barbara R. Fogel, Helen E. Danner, *Higher Education and Social Change*, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1977. Vol. II, p. 536.

attracted to teaching, consulting, and research positions overseas. More exchange arrangements for faculty based on a general concept of reciprocity must be developed. More informal departmental ties must evolve on an incremental basis. Associations representing universities in Washington, DC need to support increasingly the efforts of such promising intermediaries as the Consortium for International Cooperation in Higher Education (CICHE) in providing a major point of contact and service to interested institutions and agencies in other countries. CICHE has already succeeded in reducing considerably the confusion besetting numerous officials from other countries interested in accessing the resources of American higher education. U.S. institutions interested in international development work need to develop an institutional commitment to that area as well as policies and practices that facilitate not only the involvement of qualified faculty members and administrators in international development programs but also their re-entry, so that their experience can be of maximal value to the teaching, research, and public service role of the institution.

The Office of International Programs: A Model

It is abundantly clear that an office of international programs on campus occupied by a competent individual makes quite a difference to the international vitality of a campus and is in fact necessary for any institution with a serious commitment to internationalization. It is well worth the investment and, as the AASCU survey suggests, the presence of an international office increases the opportunities to obtain grants, which often allow the institution to recoup costs.

The following recommendations describe the head for such an office and characterize the functions to be performed. The individual chosen for such an office should have faculty rank and some teaching experience, although he may teach only an occasional course a year. It has been observed repeatedly that such individuals are almost essential to the inspiration of peer respect and cooperation. He/she should also have a proven commitment to international education, administrative ability, a knowledge of the Washington federal agencies and major private sector organizations concerned with international education, excellence in human relations, and a service orientation to the university community.

Ideally the office should report directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and not to a specific school, department, or business office. The title of the individual in charge varies somewhat but Director of International Programs or International Studies is quite common; the title of Dean for International Programs is also used. The office should be staffed with at least the Director and one full time secretary or administrative assistant. Other staff can be added as its operational responsibilities, contracts, and grants warrant it. Several such offices in AASCU institutions now employ the equivalent of one to three full-time professionals plus support staff. Ideally, that office should perform the following functions:

1. provide the leadership to an institutionwide committee on international programs

2. provide a locus of services, stimulation, and leadership in the international area

3. provide information services and some coordination in the international area to the faculty and the administration

4. assist in efforts to internationalize the curriculum and ethos of the institution

5. explore and guide international education development opportunities overseas

6. assist in creating faculty development opportunities in the international area in teaching, research, and public service

7. negotiate and implement contracts and grants in the international area

8. cooperate with international interests in the community, especially business, and significant regional or national associations concerned with international education

9. relate to or be in charge of the policy and operations of study abroad programs and foreign students on campus

10. prepare proposals to federal agencies, foundations, business, and others to help implement the commitment of the institution in the international area.

In effect, that office should symbolize a degree of centralization of and commitment to the international activities of the institution. The accent of the office should be on unselfish *service* to the international mission of the institution and to its administration, faculty, and students. Yet, it is clear that the success of the enterprise will also depend on the interest and contributions of a great many individuals in the university. The enormous reservoir of talent and good will that exists on most campuses must be tapped, cultivated, and orchestrated for the benefit of the institution. A successful office of international programs will assume the leadership necessary to perform these functions.

Background on the Funding Issue

Before the start of World War II, the U.S. government was not essentially involved in funding international studies. Between 1934 and 1942 the Rockefeller Foundation pioneered this endeavor with over $1 million in grants.

The Carnegie Corporation gave some 2.5 million for the support of non-western studies between 1947 and 1951. It is estimated that since 1952 the Ford Foundation has granted some $400 million in support of area and international studies.

During World War II, the U.S. government charged a number of universities with the responsibility for the intensive training of military personnel in language and area studies, and approximately 60 institutions helped train over 15,000 men. The Truman Doctrine of 1947 ushered the strong commitment of the United States to international involvement. The Marshall Plan in 1948 and the Act for International Development of 1950 were followed in 1953 by the university contract system engaging entire universities in technical programs overseas. The International Cooperation Administration was created in 1955 and was renamed the Agency for International Development (AID) in 1961, the same year that President Kennedy set up the Peace Corps. It was in reaction to Sputnik in 1958 that Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). While primarily geared to U.S. scientific education in the face of Soviet competition, NDEA earmarked under its Title VI a modest but sustained series of grants in international studies to U.S. colleges and universities, as well as thousands of fellowships for graduate students.

The Fulbright Act of 1946 made it possible for thousands of Americans to engage in teaching and research activities. Foreign students coming to the United States kept increasing and reached record levels of 137,000 in 1971 and 300,000 in 1981. U.S. academia had adopted, primarily with external funding, a series of major academic and service programs in the international area. What was desperately needed in the late 1960s and early 1970s was a period of consolidation and diffusion. With stimulation from the White House and the enthusiastic support of the academic community at hearings, Congress passed the International Education Act of 1966, which was meant to pump substantial funding (about 100 million dollars a year) into international studies and the "building of bridges" between the United States and other countries. Regretfully, the International Education Act was never funded, largely because of the drains caused by the Vietnam war. In addition, the Ford Foundation began in 1966 to turn away almost completely from the funding of international studies and the State Department's Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays), as well as NDEA Title VI, began receiving substantially less funding. In the development area, too, AID's work with U.S. higher education seemed to lose its high priority as that agency and other national development agencies and the World Bank turned their attention increasingly to the "poorest of the poor" in the developing countries.

A National Perspective on the Funding Issue

Campuses that had been receiving substantial external funding for area and international studies went through a series of financial and adjustment crises in the 1970s and early 1980s and the prospect for their future support from external sources is not much brighter in 1981. The preparation of area

specialists is expensive. Despite the pleas of those committed to the preparation and maintenance of area expertise and the requisite foreign languages as a national security interest, some doubted whether the real demand was as high as the university representatives were alleging. The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies[22] presented a powerful rationale for why the major sectors of U.S. society should support the study of global content and foreign languages at all levels of education, from K-12 to doctoral training and research but the large budget increase proposed (about 175 million dollars a year annually) was hit by the fiscal austerity imposed by the economic conditions in the United States in the early 1980s. Despite the severe cuts of the Reagan Administration, however, the funding for NDEA Title VI, which had been incorporated in the Higher Education Act of 1980, and other legislation concerning international programs remained reasonably close to previous levels or, as in the case of Title VI, was even increased.

Undergraduate programs in large universities, which had been the beneficiaries of substantial external funding in the international area and had maintained an impressive array of expertise in international studies, including library resources, were jolted by the financial crisis confronting their graduate schools, threatening the very survival of entire area studies programs in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Other undergraduate programs in the public and private institutions which did not have direct access to such resources and which had gradually evolved their international commitment within their regular budget, seemed to be much less affected; however, they were still concerned by the ripple effects of the financial crisis confronting higher education and the scrutiny of expenditures in support of their international programs.

Future Directions

The simple messages conveyed by realistic financial conditions are that institutions of higher learning should (1) clarify their institutional mission in the international area; (2) incorporate their international activities within their existing budgets and not depend on external support as heavily as before; (3) seek increasingly funding from local sources, public and private, expecially international business; and (4) work harder at strengthening the credibility of their foreign language and international studies programs in terms of the marketplace as well as in terms of quality liberal education. At the undergraduate level, in particular, faculty development in the international area seems critical if higher education is to convey successfully to legislators and others its commitment to international content in the curriculum and to program activities with other countries. Institutions committed to internationalization invariably find that there is a tremendous amount they can do without additional funding. Numerous options for

---

22 President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *op. cit.*

internationalizing the curriculum were suggested earlier in this study. While admitting that finances do help, it is also true that much of what is needed does not depend on external funding but instead on such key variables as the willingness of a critical number of faculty members to deepen their international approach to their disciplines and to extend themselves into comparative and interdisciplinary studies. It also depends on the commitment and skill of the leadership in orchestrating the desired changes. Institutions that engage seriously in these efforts are those which can make the best cases for external funding. Potential donors, private and public, will always look for a coherent proposal founded on genuine institutional commitment. Typical of the criteria required for grants are those incorporated in the Rules and Regulations[23] governing the international grants from the Department of Education:

(a) Commitment to international studies

(1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the applicant's commitment to the international studies program.

(2) The Secretary looks for information that shows (i) The institution's current strength as measured by the number of international studies courses offered; (ii) The extent to which planning for the implementation of the proposed program has involved the applicant's faculty, as well as administrators; (iii) The institutional commitment to the establishment, operation, and continuation of the program as demonstrated by optimal use of available personnel and other resources; and (iv) The institutional commitment to the program as demonstrated by the use of institutional funds in support of the program's objectives.

Without the legalese of governmental regulations, private foundations also look for more or less the same criteria. It is a case of those helping themselves most who will find additional help.

As the results of the AASCU survey suggest, the more centralized and well-administered the international activities of an institution the greater the chances that such an institution would have applied and would have received a grant from government, foundation, or business sources (see Table III).

In short, the fact that American higher education is currently beset by painful financial stringency in all aspects of the educational enterprise should not obscure either the awareness that internationalizing the institution is not a luxury but a necessity for quality education today or the realization that much can be done at the undergraduate level without or with very

---

23*Federal Register*/Vol. 45. No. 252, December 31, 1980, pp. 86880-86881.

little external funding. Undergraduate institutions would profit greatly by engaging in the process of identifying their mission in the international area and implementing it. This process is vital to the health of the institution and should yield, among other results, the identification of those programmatic activities that require external funding. It is on the basis of such a solid conceptual and consensus-building base that external funding could be most fruitfully sought.[24]

---

24 See Appendix B for illustrations of types of funding sources that should be considered by institutions.

4. CONCLUSION: GUIDELINES FOR AASCU INSTITUTIONS

The following are guidelines for AASCU institutions:

1. Each institution needs to examine its mission and responsibility in the international area. The process of internationalizing the institution is critical, calls for planning and consensus-building, and involves the faculty on an institution-wide basis as well as the leadership.

2. Faculty development efforts in the international area, the universalization of disciplinary work, and the promotion of interdisciplinary studies in relation to international issues are essential.

3. The implications for the curriculum of the international mission of the institution need to be examined and translated into academic and non-academic terms. The international dimension should be diffused throughout and create an institutional ethos both in terms of content as well as in attitudes of teachers and students. The ethos of the institution should reflect its international commitment.

4. A careful study of the curricular options in introducing the international dimension should serve as a basis for determining the most suitable approaches for an institution. The place of foreign languages in the curriculum area studies, comparative studies, international studies, civilizational studies, international development studies, intercultural studies, and the possible integration of these studies with the professional schools all warrant careful study.

5. A systematic inventory of the existing resources (human and material) of the institution in the international area should precede the final determination of the mission and strategies to be adopted.

6. Faculty members should be encouraged to infuse their courses, as possible, with non-western materials, to engage in comparative approaches in their teaching and research, and to address topical world issues on as much of an interdisciplinary basis as possible, individually and with the assistance of colleagues.

7. The leadership of the institution must initiate and reinforce the vital process of study and consequent implementation of the international role of the institution. Leaders who go on professional missions overseas should use that opportunity to review the overall commitment and direction of their institution in the international field. Through intangible and tangible encouragements, rewards, and incentives, the leadership of universities should indicate its recognition of faculty members, in performance in the international area.

8. The presence of a relatively centralized responsibility for international programs seems to be essential to the optimal performance of an institution. The functions to be performed by such an office are numerous, and the evidence suggests that when properly directed such a locus of responsibility can be of tremendous value to the international life of the institution both in its catalytic and its operational roles.

9. International exchanges of faculty and students can play a critical role in the internationalization of a university but must be considered a means to an end rather than an end in themselves. Sound international linkages must be promoted at the institutional level to reinforce the curricular concentrations of the institution and to discharge its international development responsibility.

   Individual faculty should be encouraged to pursue their research, teaching, and consulting interests in the international area. The admission of foreign students should be carefully scrutinized at the policy level in light of academic background and objectives, numbers, cultural representation and suitability of curriculum and infrastructure services. Programs of U.S. study abroad should be evaluated periodically with respect to integration with academic programs, nature of the experience overseas, choice of countries, regions and cultures involved, and impact of such programs on the international mission of the university.

10. The role of the institution in the community in the international area deserves special examination. To be included in such review are the relationships of the institution to the K-12 levels, the business community, the media, and the large ethnic and cultural resources that often exist around colleges and universities.

11. To enrich its overall offerings and to discharge its international mission more effectively and often more economically, institutions should examine carefully the potential of inter-institutional arrangements. Whether in the area of critical foreign languages, professional linkages overseas, or a variety of other areas in all fields of knowledge, the potential for higher quality, sometimes sheer availability, and economy is there.

12. Funding efforts in the international program area are most likely to succeed when they are based on a soundly conceived, institutionally-diffused and appreciated mission for the institution. Such an effort pays off in a variety of ways when supported by the institutional commitment and the faculty. Institutions that have refined their mission and objectives in the international area and are doing in the curriculum what is needed to internationalize their campus without external funding find it considerably easier to raise additional

funds, locally and nationally. This is probably the fundamental reason why while some institutions are not doing much internationally and find it hard to raise funds, others of comparable budget and size have developed strong services in the international area accompanied by a number of contracts and grants.

13. There are many colorful and instructional activities which institutions can engage in in the international area, including cultural festivals, occasional speakers and forums, programs involving foreign students or U.S. students returning from travel and study abroad. These activities are most useful and should be encouraged. It may be well to remember, however, that these worthwhile programs cannot be a substitute for the systematic and planned pursuit of *institutionalizing the international dimension* throughout the curriculum and the campus.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *International/Intercultural Education in Selected State Colleges and Universities: An Overview and Five Cases.* Washington, D.C., November 1977.

Association of American Colleges. *Toward Education with a Global Perspective,* A Report of the National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies. Washington, D.C. 1980.

Brademas, John. *International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects.* Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Burn, Barbara B. *Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

The College and World Affairs. New York: The Hazen Foundation, 1964.

Council on Learning. *What College Students Know And Believe About Their World.* New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, March 1981.

Education and World Affairs. *The University Looks Abroad: Approaches to World Affairs at Six American Universities.* New York: Walker and Company, 1965.

Harari, Maurice. *Global Dimension in U.S. Education: The University.* New York: Education Commission of the International Studies Association, Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association and Center for War/Peace Studies of the New York Friends Group, Inc., 1972.

Institute of International Education. *Open Doors: 1979-80,* Report on International Educational Exchange, New York, 1981.

International Education Act. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-Ninth Congress, Second Session on S. 2874, August 17, 19 and September 19, 1966.

Morrill, J. L. *The University and World Affairs.* New York: The Ford Foundation, 1960.

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. *Strength Through Wisdom, A Critique of U.S. Capability.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1979.

Sanders, Irwin T. and Ward, Jennifer C. *Bridges to Understanding: International Programs of American Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Simon, Paul. *The Tongue-Tied American.* New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1980.

Spaulding, Seth and Flack, Michael J. *The World's Students in the United States.* New York: Praeger, 1976.

U.S. Commissioner of Education Task Force on Global Education. "Report with Recommendations," Washington, D.C., October 1979.

World Bank. *Education, Sector Policy Paper.* Washington, D.C. World Bank, 1980, Third Edition, April 1980.

APPENDIX A

INTERNATIONAL/INTERCULTURAL* PROGRAMS
AASCU OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS
FALL SURVEY 1980

Directions: Please return this survey to the following address within 30 days if possible: AASCU/Office of International Programs, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036. Feel free to use the back of the questionnaire or attach additional paper if needed. If a question should not apply to your institution, please leave the answer space blank.

1. _____ (for OIP use)

2. Name of Institution _____

3. City/State/Zip Code _____

4. Give name and title of individual on campus with primary responsibility for coordination of international/intercultural programs.

For the following yes-no questions please check the appropriate answer.

5. Do you have an institution-wide committee concerned with the development of international/intercultural programs?
   yes _____ no _____

   If yes, give name and title of the Chairman of the Committee.

6. Do you have an office of international programs?
   yes _____ no _____

7. Is the individual in charge of that office assigned to it: (please check)
   full-time _____
   part-time _____ (give % of time budgeted to office _____)

8. Is that individual also a member of the faculty and teaching one or more courses a semester?
   yes _____ no _____

*Intercultural Programs are defined here as "programs which make the connection on a comparative or other basis between the U.S. cultural complex and cultures in other societies".

9. How many other persons are budgeted partly or totally to this office?
_____ number of persons

10. What is the title and rank of the individual heading that office?

11. What office does that individual report to?

12. What other offices on campus report to the office of international programs?

13. Check the areas below which are handled by your office of international programs:

___ development of collaborative arrangements and contracts with foreign universities and governments
___ administration of foregoing arrangements
___ assistance in the internationalization of the curriculum
___ administration of study abroad programs for U.S. students
___ administration of foreign student programs on campus
___ assistance to foreign professors on campus
___ assistance to U.S. professors going overseas
___ interpretation of national developments at the legislative level, in government agencies, and in the private sector with respect to trends and opportunities in international education
___ liaison with the community with respect to citizenship education programs and other programs related to the international/intercultural area

14. Identify those programs (other than single courses) in your curriculum which emphasize international/intercultural studies (e.g. Latin American Studies, Third World Studies, Cross Cultural Training, etc.). Give title and short description of each program and specify if it is undergraduate or graduate level. Feel free to attach the appropriate pages from your institution's catalog in lieu of detailing the program here.

15. Has your institution applied within the last three years for a grant for international/intercultural studies program from a U.S. government agency, a business corporation, or a private foundation?
yes _____ no _____

16. If yes, have you received such a grant/s?
yes _____ no _____

If you received a grant, please give the date of the award; the title of the project, the name of the funding agency, and the duration of the project.

17. Do you have formal or informal inter-institutional arrangements in the U.S. to implement or facilitate your international/intercultural programs?

yes _____ no _____

If yes, please specify the title of the program, the institutions involved, and the purpose of the arrangement.

18. Does your institution have a listing of faculty who are qualified for international/intercultural teaching, research and other types of programs?

yes _____ no _____

If yes, would you please provide us with a copy.

If no, do you plan to prepare such a listing? _____
When will it be available? _____

19. What other activities does your institution offer with an international/intercultural emphasis? (please check)

1. _____ summer programs
2. _____ extension courses
3. ____ outreach programs to the community
4. ____ other, please describe

Please attach applicable brochures, pamphlets, etc. on above programs.

20. Does your institution offer a program of courses in Ethnic Studies?

yes _____ no _____

If yes, please describe briefly (or attach information).

21. What languages does your institution offer? (please check)

1. ____ French
2. ____ Spanish
3. ____ Italian
4. ____ Portuguese
5. ____ German
6. ____ Russian
7. ____ Chinese
8. ____ Japanese
9. ____ Arabic
10. ____ Farsi
11. ____ Slavic (other than Russian) please specify
12. ____ Hebrew
13. ____ Latin
14. ____ Greek
15. ____ Scandinavian please specify
16. ____ African please specify
17. ____ other: please specify

22. Does your institution have any foreign language requirements for graduation? yes _____ no _____

If yes, what are the requirements?

23. Does your institution have any requirements (for graduation) for courses in the international and/or intercultural academic area?
yes _____ no _____

If yes, what are the requirements?

24. Does your institution sponsor any study abroad programs?
yes _____ no _____

25. If yes, are these programs open to students from other institutions?
yes _____ no _____

Please attach program brochures.

26. Estimate the number of your students who were studying abroad for at least one semester (equivalent) during the academic year 1979-80.

27. Does your institution offer English As A Second Language?
yes _____ no _____

Please list names of courses and levels and/or attach relevant materials describing courses or programs.

28. Estimate the number of foreign students (Fall head count) who were attending your institution during the academic year 1979-80.

_____ undergraduate _____ graduate

29. Do you have any program relations with the less developed countries other than study abroad? yes _____ no _____

If yes, please identify briefly (e.g., assistance in agricultural development with the Ministry of Agriculture in Pakistan; or a faculty exchange program with the University of Ghana in Africa).

30. Do you have any program relations with the developed countries other than study abroad? yes _____ no _____

If yes, please describe briefly.

31. Estimate the number of your faculty who were abroad during the 1979-80 academic year (other than the summer) for purposes of teaching, research, or international development.

32. Estimate the number of foreign faculty who were visiting on your campus during the academic year 1979-80 (other than summer) for at least one month (exclude faculty of foreign background who are in permanent residence in the U.S.)

33. Do you have any handbooks, brochures, newsletters or reports describing the international/intercultural components of your institution? yes _____ no _____

    If yes, please mail under separate cover to: AASCU Office of International Programs.

34. If you have plans for the development of new programs or directions in the international/intercultural field, please describe them briefly:

Name of person(s) answering this survey on international/intercultural programs:

Name

Title

Date

To the person completing this survey:

We in the AASCU Office of International Programs greatly appreciate your assistance with this survey. If you should have any questions concerning its contents, please contact Ginnie Russell, Office of International Programs, AASCU, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036; (202) 293-7070.

APPENDIX B

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMING: FUNDING SOURCES

This appendix represents a compilation of illustrative sources of support, both federal and private, for projects of an international nature on U.S. university campuses.

Selected U.S. Government Agencies Which Fund International Programs*

The following U.S. government agencies fund international programs. The programs listed here are geared specifically for the support of institutional projects. It is recommended that before submitting proposals you contact the agency to determine program guidelines and deadlines and to obtain grant application forms, if required.

U.S. Department of Education

1) **The International Understanding Program:** this program will be included in the block grant funding provided by the federal government to the state and local education agencies. Its future status is unclear, as funding will be determined by individual state priorities. Your state department of education can identify the office responsible for implementation of the education block grant and will be able to advise you of the international understanding activities within your particular state.

2) **Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program:** this program provides funding for the planning, development, and implementation of comprehensive programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages. Contact: Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program, Office of International Education, ROB No. 3, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202. (202) 245-9425.

3) **Group Projects Abroad:** This program is aimed at colleges and universities, consortia, state education agencies, and non-profit education associations. Funding is for summer seminars, curriculum development projects, or group research or study in advanced language training and area studies. Only institutions may apply for Group Projects Abroad. Eligible institutions present proposals to the Department of Education. Institutions which are awarded grants then select the participants. Contact: Group Projects Abroad, Office of International Education, ROB No. 3, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202. (202) 245-9425.

*At this writing, funding for a number of government agencies and their programs is uncertain. It is advisable to check on funding before proceeding with the proposal process.

4) **Foreign Curriculum Consultants:** This program provides funding to bring specialists from other nations to the United States to assist in the development and implementation of foreign language and area studies curricula in state departments of education, large school systems, university outreach programs, smaller four-year colleges, groups of community colleges, and developing institutions. For further details and program guidelines, contact: International Studies Branch, Division of International Services and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202. (202) 245-9425.

5) **National Resource Centers and Fellowships Program:** This program provides institutions of higher education with fellowships for graduate and undergraduate students to allow them to receive training in modern foreign language fields or to provide research and training in international studies. Contact: National Resource Centers and Fellowships Program, U.S. Department of Education, Office of International Education, ROB No. 3, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202. (202) 245-2356.

6) **International Studies and Research Program:** Grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, public and non-profit private agencies and organizations, and individuals in the following areas: studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages; research on more effective methods of teaching and evaluation competency in foreign languages and related fields; the development of materials for use in the expansion or improvement of instruction in foreign languages and foreign area studies; research and development of materials that contribute to Americans' understanding of the cultures, actions, policies, and interrelationships of nations. Contact: Research Program, Research Branch, DATR, Office of International Education, Room 3669, ROB No. 3, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202. (202) 245-2761.

International Communication Agency*

Private Sector Programs: These programs support non-profit activities of U.S. organizations that enhance the U.S. public's competence in world affairs through greater understanding of other societies, especially in three areas: advancing basic cultural knowledge, enhancing the international competency of leaders, and encouraging an international perspective. Contact: International Communication Agency, Office of Private Sector Programs, ECA/P, Room 702, 1717 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20547. (202) 724-9702.

*As of this writing, the name of the agency is International Communication Agency (ICA). However, it is expected that the name will change back to United States Information Agency (USIA) sometime in 1982.

National Science Foundation

The National Science Foundation has the following programs which fund international activities:

1) Undergraduate Research Participation
2) Grants for Scientific Research in the Social and Economic Sciences, including the following specific areas: economics, geography and regional science, history and philosophy of science, law and social science, political science, sociology, and measurement methods and data resources.
3) International Travel Grants
4) Research Conferences, Workshops, and Symposia
5) Cooperative Science Program
6) Special Foreign Currency Program
7) U.S.-India Exchange of Scientists Program
8) U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation: Cooperative Research Projects
9) Science in Developing Countries

The following publications will prove valuable in describing the various programs and support available from the National Science Foundation: Guide to Programs, Division of International Programs, International Travel Support Program, Guide to Science Education Programs, and Grants for Scientific Research.

To obtain a copy of any of these publications, specify title and write: Reference and Records Management Section, Attention: Publications, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550.

National Endowment for the Humanities

1) **Institutional Grants:** These support the design, testing, implementation, and evaluation of curricular programs that will strengthen humanities teaching and learning at individual colleges and universities through the following three programs: a) Consultant Grants; b) Pilot Grants, and c) Implementation Grants. Contact: Institutional Grants Program, 806 15th Street, NW. Washington, DC 20506. (202) 724-0311 for consultant grants; (202) 724-0393 for pilot and implementation grants.

2) **Higher Education Projects Grants:** These support the design, testing, and development of models for widespread use of imaginative approaches to humanities education by supporting one- to three-year demonstration projects that center on curriculum development. These grants comprise three kinds of activities: a) Humanities Institutes; b) Curriculum Materials Grants; c) General Projects Grants. Contact: Higher Education Projects Program, Division of Research, National Endowment for the Humanities, 806 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20506. (202) 724-0373.

National Institute of Education

Unsolicited Proposals: This program funds basic and applied research, planning surveys, evaluations, investigations, experiments, and developmental activities directly related to research in a field of education not specifically addressed in other NIE programs. Contact: Unsolicited Proposal Coordinator, National Institute of Education, Room 639, 1200 19th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20208 (202) 254-7920; Note: Request information statement of Unsolicited Proposals.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)

The Comprehensive Program: Grants are awarded for a wide range of projects that contribute to better learning, are cost-effective, and have the potential for reaching a wide audience. Contact: The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3123, Washington, DC 20202. (202) 245-8091.

Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission

Japanese Studies in U.S. Education: Under this program, grants are awarded for language teaching, library support, and professional education in business, law, journalism, architecture, and environmental design. Contact: Executive Director, Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 709, Washington, DC 20009. (202) 673-5295.

Foundation/Non-U.S. Government Support

Foundation Support for International Programs: The following foundations are among those which have funded international education programs in the past several years. However, before approaching any of these foundations (or others not listed here), it is highly recommended that you first contact them to learn what their current program guidelines are. Since many foundations request that you initially approach them by letter, addresses only have been included.

An excellent source for information on foundations is the *Foundation Director* which is published by the Foundation Center. The *Directory* is indexed by foundation name, state, and areas of interest. It lists the activities, purposes, and funding range of foundations. In addition to the *Foundation Directory*, the Foundation Center publishes a number of other useful publications. For further information, contact your development office or the Foundation Center, 888 7th Avenue, New York, NY 10019 (212) 975-1120.

International Program
Carnegie Corporation of New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Grants for Canadian Studies in the U.S.
The William H. Donner
Foundation, Inc.
630 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10020

Educational Research and Development Program
Exxon Education Foundation
111 West 49th Street
New York, NY 10020

Grants to Organizations and Institutions
The William and Flora Hewlett
Two Palo Alto Square
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Lilly and Company Foundation
307 East McCarty Street
Indianapolis, IN 46206

The Henry Luce Foundation, Inc.
111 West 50th Street
New York, NY 10020

Tinker Foundation
645 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Xerox Fund
Xerox Corporation
High Ridge Park
Stamford, CT 06904

Compton Foundation, Inc.
c/o Randolph R. Compton
Ten Hanover Square
New York, NY 10005

The Bydale Foundation
60 East 42nd Street, Room 5010
New York, NY 10017

Ivy Fund, Inc.
One Bankers Trust Plaza
New York, NY 10006

Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017

The Japan Foundation
Suite 570, Watergate Office Bldg.
600 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20037

Wingspread Conference Center
The Johnson Foundation
Racine, WI 53401

Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc.
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019

Kellogg (W.K.) Foundation
400 North Avenue
Battle Creek, MI 49016

American Express Foundation
American Express Plaza
New York, NY 10004

Mertz-Gilmore (Joyce) Foundation
39 West 11th Street
New York, NY 10011

Dodge (Cleveland H.) Foundation, Inc.
641 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Overbrook Foundation
730 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10019

Resource Publications for International Education Funding Sources

Grants and Fellowships Guide (1981), International Studies Newsletter Volume 8, Number 6, of the International Studies Association, James F. Byrnes International Center, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 29208. (803) 777-2933 (Cost to non-ISA members is $7.00 + $.50 handling and postage)

The CISP International Studies Funding Book, Council for Intercultural Studies and Programs, 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 1231, New York, NY 10017 ($50.00 for non-CISP members; $35.00 for CISP members at 40% discount)

A Guide to Scholarships, Fellowships, and Grants: A Selected Bibliography, Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017 (Single copies free; for bulk rate write to IIE). The latest edition of this bibliography is the May 1979 issue.

International Education Programs of the U.S. Government: An Investory, compiled by Helen R. Wiprud, International Education Task Force and the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (1980). Provides summary information on 181 programs in 28 federal departments and agencies, essentially as of mid-1979. May be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Order by GPO stock No. 052-003-00795-9. ($8.50)